

Application No. 10/674,355  
Amendment dated January 12, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of October 12, 2005

Docket No.: 0698-0164P

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are now present in this application.

The specification and claims 9, 10 and 12 have been amended. Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 5 and 7 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Matsumoto, U.S. Publication 2005/0097540, in view of Aguilar et al., U.S. Patent 6,892,297.

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Matsumoto and Aguilar et al., and further in view of Venkiteswaran, U.S. Publication 2003/0229752. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Matsumoto and Aguilar et al., and further in view of Morrison et al., U.S. Publication 2003/0106051. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Matsumoto and Aguilar et al., and further in view of Dye, U.S. Patent 6,145,069. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Matsumoto and Aguilar et al., and further in view of Bealkowski et al., U.S. Patent 5,878,256. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 9-11, 13 and 14 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Matsumoto in view of Aguilar et al., and further in view of Malecek et al., U.S. Patent 5,295,255. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Application No. 10/674,355  
Amendment dated January 12, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of October 12, 2005

Docket No.: 0698-0164P

Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Matsumoto, Aguilar et al. and Malecek et al., and further in view of Venkiteswaran. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Matsumoto, Aguilar et al., and Malecek et al., and further in view of Bealkowski et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recited a flash ROM content updating system. This system includes a primary information unit, an information register, a check-sum module, a logic comparison module, an addressing module and an information updating module. The primary information unit has a plurality of memory blocks. The information register stores updated information inputted to the system. The updated information is divided into a plurality of update information blocks corresponding to the size of the memory blocks in the primary information unit.

In independent method claim 9, the updated information is divided into a plurality of update information blocks corresponding to the size of the memory blocks in the primary information register. Both of these independent claims recite features which are not found in the prior art utilized by the Examiner. In rejecting dependent claim 12, the Examiner has added the Venkiteswaran reference, but this was for its alleged teaching of having the updated information be for BIOS or embedded software. This additional reference does not overcome the deficiency of the primary reference to Matsumoto which is used to reject claim 1 and is used to reject claim 9 with the added teachings of Aguilar et al and Malecek et al. The Examiner has not relied upon the Aguilar et al and Malecek et al. references to teach this deficiency.

Application No. 10/674,355  
Amendment dated January 12, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of October 12, 2005

Docket No.: 0698-0164P

Apart from the independent claims, the dependent claims further define the instant invention from the utilized prior art. For example dependent claims 8 and 15 recite the information updating module is a ROM burner or burner simulation software. The secondary reference to Bealkowski et al. used to reject these claims does not teach a ROM burner, but an EPROM burner instead. A ROM has an inner structure and manufacturing process completely different from those of an EPROM. One skilled in the art would not utilize the EPROM burner disclosed by Bealkowski et al to burn a ROM.

Nonetheless, both independent claims 1 and 9 set forth a system and method which are neither suggested nor rendered obvious by the prior art utilized by the Examiner. As such, the prior art rejections should now be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Favorable reconsideration and an early Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

In the event that any outstanding matters remain in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

Application No. 10/674,355  
Amendment dated January 12, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of October 12, 2005

Docket No.: 0698-0164P

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: January 12, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By \_\_\_\_\_  
Joe McKinney Muncy  
Registration No.: 32,334  
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP  
8110 Gatehouse Road  
Suite 100 East  
P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000  
Attorney for Applicant